

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	ADDI 7E44 HQ		
2			
3			
4			

Remarks:

25X1A9a

1. The attached memo concerns your question to me about para. 5b in [redacted] 3 March memo on cost estimates. The question concerned the assumption in the CRS plan for dissemination that the Operations Center and/or Commo will continue the alerting and advance copies responsibilities.
2. The attachment consists of a flow chart of the processing of electricals thru CIA. Conceptually, MAD initially aimed at the bottom part of the chart. We anticipate moving upward in the chart as skill permits and as users desire such service. Conceptually, the Commo plan attacks the whole process in one gulp.
3. CRS, of course, prefers its own concepts because:
- a. They permit bite-size tasks and bite-size successes or failures with bite-size costs.
 - b. We do not know (and somewhat doubt) that the alert function can be automatically performed.
 - c. We do not know (and somewhat doubt) that automation of the alerting function would be cost effective.
4. These considerations are, of course, intimately involved in the differences between CRS views and OC views on the desirability of a near-real time system (OC) and a frequently operated batch system (CRS). This difference is discussed in the last two sentences of para. 4 of my 2 March memo to you on the dissemination study.

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
H. C. EISENBEISS 2E60 HQ X5211	7 Mar
UNCLASSIFIED FORM NO. 1-67 237	CONFIDENTIAL Use previous editions GPO : 1968 O - 297-542 (40)